UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/672,633	10/672,633 09/26/2003		David G. Boyer	633-061us	8084	
47912	7590	07/26/2011		EXAMINER		
Avaya DEMONT &				MEHRPOUR, NAGHMEH		
100 COMMONS WAY, STE 250 HOLMDEL, NJ 07733				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2617		
				MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
•				07/26/2011	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of Non-Compliant Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review (New Time Period for Filing Brief)

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/672,633	
Examiner	Art Unit
Naghmeh Mehrpour	2617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed on 06/27/11 is non-compliant for the following reason(s). See Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Pilot Program, 1296 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 67 (July 12, 2005). A conference will not be held.

The time period for filing an appeal brief will be reset to be one month from the mailing of this notice, or the balance of the two-month time period running from the receipt of the notice of appeal, whichever is greater. Further, the time period for filing of the appeal brief is extendible under 37 CFR 1.136 based upon the mail date of this notice or the receipt date of the notice of appeal, as applicable.

of the i	notice of appeal, as applicable.
1. 🔲	The Request was not filed concurrently with a proper Notice of Appeal.
2. 🔲	The Request does not include accompanying arguments for which the review is being requested.
3. 🗌	The arguments accompanying the Request exceed five (5) pages.
4. 🗌	The arguments accompanying the Request are directed to petitionable, not appealable, matters.
5. 🗌	An after-final or proposed amendment was filed with the Request, or after the filing of the Request but before a panel decision from the pre-appeal brief conference.
6. 🗌	The request was filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).
7. x	Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):
•	
	The notice of appeal filing fee is considered improper.

/Timothy Cole/ Timothy Cole, Patent Appeal Specialist Patent Appeal Center